(2)

Can 375.7.5 .

A LETTER TO THE EARL of CHATHAM.

by Sir Wm Meredith

[Price One Shilling.]

A

This is sometimes attributed to
Thomas, Lord Lyttelton, & sometimes to
Sir William Meredith.

Lyttelton, Thomas, 2d baron
(3)

A

LETTER

TO THE

William Pitt
1st EARL of CHATHAM,

ON THE

QUEBEC BILL.

THE FIFTH EDITION.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, IN THE STRAND.

M CCLXXIV.

Can 375.7.5

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
EBELING COLLECTION
GIFT OF ISRAEL THORNDIKE
1918

My LORD,

THE bill for the government of Quebec, whilſt it engages the attention of the public, cannot but bring back to our minds that glorious æra when Canada was added to the Britiſh empire, by the ſucceſs of his Majeſty's arms, directed by the genius, and animated by the vigour of your councils. It has too often happened that national *wiſdom* has ſlept, while the ſpirit of conqueſt has been awake; in the midſt of victories and of triumphs, we are not to wonder that the low and ſtill voice of juriſprudence was never heard;

but, at length, is the time come when a ſyſtem of government is to be formed for that extenſive country, differing from our own in her religion, her laws, her habits, and her cuſtoms. Had the queſtion once occurred to your Lordſhip how that ought to be done, the poſſeſſion of Canada might not perhaps have been the firſt object of your care in preference to Guadaloupe, Martinique, and the other rich iſlands which were reſtored to the French and Spaniards in the Weſt Indies. But it does not appear that the civil eſtabliſhment of Canada had ever a place in your thoughts; becauſe, after thirteen years poſſeſſion of the country, your mind was ſo entirely vacant on this ſubject, that I don't find your Lordſhip propoſed one idea of your own, either for the framing of any law, or for the amendment of that law which has lately received the royal aſſent.

If

If ever there was an event on which the public might demand an opinion, it had a right to yours on the ſettlement of Canada. From your rank and experience in the ſtate, your importance in your country, and, above all, as the atchievement was yours, the manner of maintaining it ſhould have been yours alſo. You was the miniſter, when Canada was conquered. When you returned to power a ſecond time, you propoſed no legiſlative act for its regulation and government; muſt I then ſay to you, my Lord, "Vincere "ſcis, victoriâ uti neſcis."—If your abilities are confeſſed, who can excuſe your neglect? Or if, in this buſineſs, either inaccuracy of head, inattention of mind, or incorrectneſs of judgment, may be imputed to any man, on whom can that charge fall more juſtly than upon your Lordſhip? Why then did you chooſe this peculiar moment to

break forth from your retirement? Surely, my Lord, your condeſcenſion is not ſuch as to lead you to become the meer harbinger of my Lord Mayor, and his addreſs *within* the palace, and of his co-patriots *without*, who attended his Majeſty from St. James's to the parliament.

The *doors* of the houſe of lords are ſhut, but Lord Chatham's expreſſions are not (nor are they meant to be) confined. I mean not to comment on your aſſortment of the epithets by which you deſcribed the act of parliament—they were "*atrocious, ſhallow, inept.*" Popery, you ſaid, was eſtabliſhed, the Proteſtant church devoted, the veil of its temple rent aſunder; and that the King's miniſters might as well begin to pull down all the proteſtant ſteeples; for theſe miniſters had at length thrown

off

off the maſque, and opened their plan of deſpotiſm.

This plan of deſpotiſm, my Lord, is the ſubſtitution of an act of parliament in lieu of a government by proclamation; a proclamation which at firſt was dictated, has been often varied, and till this time has ſubſiſted by the meer will and pleaſure of the crown. It was *imperium hominis* that has governed the Canadians ſince the peace; it is *imperium legis* that is to govern them hereafter. Is it neceſſary for me to explain to your Lordſhip which is a ſtate of liberty, and which of tyranny? Converſant with the hiſtory and fate of nations, your Lordſhip knows that all thoſe unhappy people who have loſt their liberties, have ſeen thoſe liberties end preciſely where the government of will began. But your Lordſhip is pleaſed to

reverſe

reverſe this propoſition; and you, who in your love of paradoxes formerly told us that Canada was conquered in Germany, now tell us that this ſame Canada is enſlaved, becauſe it is no longer to be governed by proclamation, but by law.

Let us ſtop for a moment, to ſee what the government of Canada was, under the proclamation which you wiſh to perpetuate,—it comprehended Eaſt Florida, Weſt Florida, and the Grenades, together with Canada, countries as different in their eſtabliſhments as in their ſoil, and in their climate; various therefore were the inſtructions given to the ſeveral governors, and afterwards changed according as information and experience pointed out new ſyſtems. In Canada, the French laws alone prevailed till 1764, then the Engliſh laws

got

got ſome footing. The governors and officers of juſtice *always* doubtful which to take for their guide, ſometimes preferring the Engliſh, ſometimes the French laws, as each ſeemed applicable to the caſe before them—One year a proclamation, another year an inſtruction to a governor, another year a local ordinance, changed the principle, and varied the courſe of their juſticiary proceedings.—In this ſtate of fluctuation, no man knew by what right he could take, or give, inherit, or convey, poſſeſs, or enjoy property; or by what mode or rule he could bring his right to a trial. One neceſſary conſequence was a frequent reſort to the crown for amendment, explanation, and deciſion; "cujus eſt "condere, ejus eſt interpretari."—And what leſs than deſpotiſm is the power of the crown, when it can create or interpret, eſtabliſh or deſtroy laws, by virtue of its own mandates?

The

The condition of theſe wretched people under this government, is deſcribed by lord Coke in the very motto which he choſe for his works, "miſera "eſt ſervitus ubi jus eſt vagum aut in-"cognitum." I need not tell your Lordſhip that the parliament of Henry VIII. gave the king's proclamations the power of law; it muſt give ſome comfort to all ſober people to ſee the parliament of this day annul the force of a proclamation, in order to eſtabliſh law.—If therefore I can agree with you, my Lord, in thinking the king's miniſters are ſo atrocious as to have formed any plan of deſpotiſm, I muſt agree with you alſo, that they are more inept and ſhallow in the execution, ſince they have let go the very power which you ſay they graſp at. And if there could ever be a proper time to inſult the king's perſon with a cry of arbitrary power, ſurely, my Lord, there

could

could have been no time leſs ſeaſonable than that, when he was going to give his aſſent in parliament to reſtore to the Canadians their birth-right in their laws, and to relinquiſh that very power which conqueſt had put in his hands.

This proclamation, however, we are told, with the treaty, and other acts of royal authority, was conſidered as an engagement, under which the coloniſts embarked their perſons, and the merchants their fortunes for Canada, and that the national faith was plighted to form a government *as near as might be* agreeable to the laws of England; for it is ſaid that none would have embarked or traded thither, without the proſpect of Engliſh laws, and of Engliſh juries. How far the real engagement has been kept, and whether any part of the laws of England, that could be executed, have been with-held, we

ſhall enquire bye and bye; but firſt let me appeal to your Lordſhip's knowledge, and the knowledge of every man, whether it is neceſſary there ſhould be a trial by jury, wherever our merchants export their manufactures? In all our great foreign markets there are no juries: in America there *are* juries; but if you will aſk the merchant whether he expects a ſurer payment from Hamburgh, *&c.* or from Boſton, I don't believe he will anſwer for the Boſtonians.

It would be impertinent, my Lord, to introduce what I ſhall take the liberty to ſay upon juries, with any panegyrick upon that bleſſed inſtitution.—Its praiſes are written in our hearts: but the conſtitution of juries may be compared to a fabrick, where every minute material is eſſentially neceſſary to the ſafety, uſefulneſs, and beauty of the

the whole. Permit me then juſt to mention what an Engliſh jury *is*, before I aſk what a Canadian jury *muſt be*. In England, the ſheriff in a public manner takes the names out of the liſt of freeholders, as chance has placed them. He *may* return ſix panels, which are ſeventy-two jurors, and he *cannot* return leſs than four, which are forty-eight at every aſſize; and, that theſe jurors may not become hackneyed in their office, or marked for ſeduction, none are to be returned, but who have not ſerved for two years before, (except in Middleſex, where the law has been altered, perhaps for the worſe, for Middleſex juries, though better practiſed, are not more reſpectable than other juries;) and in Yorkſhire, becauſe of the largeneſs of the county, freeholders cannot be returned but once in four years.

Thus, my Lord, the uncertainty of who ſhall be jurors, and the nature of the office itſelf commencing inſtantly, and ending inſtantly in public court, gives no poſſibility of previous ſolicitation or ſeduction; but ſtill there follows a right of challenge, to exclude every man againſt whom a ſuſpicion lies of partiality or prejudice, whether from affection, affinity, or intereſt.

Let us now, my Lord, ſee what is the fund for an *Engliſh jury* in Canada; the number of freeholders (I do not ſay there are none) is ſmall indeed; but there are about three hundred Engliſhmen, who are houſe-keepers, and of theſe, perhaps thirty or forty are of the rank of merchants and tradeſmen; the reſt are diſbanded ſoldiers, moſt of them ſutlers; and it is a melancholy conſideration that their chief traffick is in ſpirituous

rituous liquors, of which they ſhare pretty largely with their cuſtomers the common ſoldiers. The courts of juſtice ſit once a week. The number of the better ſort of Engliſh will not afford one legal panel in the whole year, and inſufficient to do the buſineſs of juries, even ſuppoſing them to give up their time, and every other occupation to that ſervice only: Mr. Maſeres * therefore admits that the burthen of attendance would be intolerable *without pay*; and he propoſes five ſhillings a head for every time they ſerve: thus the office of jurymen would become a trade, a trade indeed, that none of the better ſort would follow, but muſt fall of courſe upon thoſe veterans who have left the army for the gin ſhop: Such muſt be the

* Attorney General of Quebec, who underwent a long examination at the bar of the Houſe of Commons, during the courſe of the Quebec Bill.

Engliſh jury in Canada, without freeholders, without challenge, without change, and in ſhort without one attribute of an Engliſh jury. *Corruptio optimi fit peſſima*, is a true old adage, and I ſpeak it as a proof of the perfection of an Engliſh jury, that in an imperfect or corrupted ſtate it would be the worſt way of trial upon earth.

But it may be ſaid there are above an hundred thouſand Canadians qualified to ſerve upon juries; why not take your juries from them? Becauſe your Lordſhip will hardly truſt the property of your countrymen to a jury of Canadians only. But the juries may be mixed,—in what proportion? If you take an *equal* number of Engliſh and of Canadians, how are they to decide at all? Or take an *unequal* number, and decide by the vote, (as in courts martial) then if the majority of the jury be

Cana-

Canadians, the verdict will be the ſame as if the whole was Canadian, or if you throw the majority on the ſide of the Engliſh, where is the impartiality, on which the Canadian can depend? Beſides, the civil law of France, and the trial by jury in England, are ſo diſſonant, that the forms of one can never be blended into proceedings of the other; the rules in reſpect of tenures, alienations, dowers, and inheritances are quite different;---how could the law go on in the two different languages? If the *Canadian* ſhould have a cauſe to try, how can his *advocate* prepare the proceſs for an *Engliſh jury?* Or if he goes to an Engliſh attorney, how is the latter to ſettle a proceeding according to the laws of France? In truth, my Lord, as Canada is now conſtituted, common ſenſe revolts againſt the eſtabliſhment of a trial by jury in civil caſes, whatever cla-

clamours may be incited by ſuch as are ignorant of its tendency, and will never know its effects. But, happily, in criminal caſes, a trial by jury *is* practicable, and therefore is it confirmed by the legiſlature. In criminal proſecutions, the forms are leſs complex, the pleadings ſimple, and the proceſs ſummary. To the fact of guilt or innocence, one man is as competent as another; and in our own courts, it is the actual practice, where a foreigner is to be tried, to have a jury *de medietate linguæ*, one half Engliſh, one half Foreigners.

I mean not, my Lord, a general defence of the criminal laws of England, as they are of late years multiplied and extended. For if a moiety of thoſe who are condemned were to ſuffer death, their blood would cry out for vengeance; and I am perſuaded, that the frequency

quency of pardons, even where mercy is due, gives riſe to nine in ten of the theſts and robberies that are committed. But the French law of torture to procure confeſſion, is to us unknown. On the contrary, the accuſed perſon is, or ought to be, warned from injuring himſelf by his own confeſſion. It is but modern law that any man could be convicted on his own confeſſion, and even now confeſſions ought not to be admitted without the greateſt caution.

To us is unknown likewiſe all cruelty of puniſhment; the inſtruments of barbarity and tyranny are not to be ſeen in our executions. From thoſe appendages of deſpotiſm the Canadians are now delivered, and may live protected in their fortunes, their honours, and their lives, under what I truſt will

ſtand for ever, the impregnable fortreſs of an Engliſh jury.

In the courſe of all the evidence that has been laid before the public, we find that the Canadians have expreſſed one conſtant uniform wiſh to be governed by their own laws, and that the Engliſh have as fervently deſired to be governed by the laws of England. The Canadians are above 100,000, the Engliſh not more than 2000 men, women, and children. The legiſlature was therefore to conſider whether the law and government ought to be adapted to the *many* or to the *few*.

There can be no rule for the compoſing of laws, but the ſentiments and inclinations of thoſe who are to be governed by them.

In a ſtate of nature, liberty knows no bound but that of ſuperior force.

Jura inventa metu injuſti, and that portion of liberty which each man is willing to give up for the convenience, ſafety, and protection of individuals, of families, of ſocieties, and of ſtates, is the firſt principle of law. It is true, the multitude do not compoſe the form, but it muſt be framed to correſpond with their genius and temper, ſo that their underſtandings may be prepared to meet, and their hearts ready to embrace it.—The habits, cuſtoms, and manners of a people, are the mirror in which alone their general diſpoſition may be ſeen; even regard muſt be had to their prejudices and their weakneſs; for *law muſt be enacted* (as Grotius has expreſſed it) "cum ſenſu humanæ imbecillitatis."

When Solon was complimented on having given good laws to his countrymen, his reply was, "They are only such as "the Athenians are capable of receiving." Even the law of God, as propoſed by Moſes, was ſubmitted to the judgment of the people before it was adopted by them *.

But if theſe rules are indiſpenſable in the *formation*, they apply much more forcibly to the actual eſtabliſhment of law. If nothing but violence can *impoſe* law, it would be ſtill greater tyranny to rob a nation of that law which they approve upon experience, and which is endeared by habit. Allowing then that the Canadians prefer a worſe law to a better, even that bad choice is deciſive upon the conduct of Great Britain. They

* Exodus.

yielded

yielded themſelves up to our protection and our faith. How then can we deprive them of the firſt rights of human nature?

We are now come to that part of the bill which relates to their religion; and knowing, my Lord, how much you are an admirer of civil liberty, and can repreſent it with ſo many graces and advantages, I ſhould have been glad to have heard that your Lordſhip, with equal grace and dignity, had ſupported the cauſe of *religious* liberty. But it ſeems you declared that no true Proteſtant could ſupport this bill.—No true Proteſtant, my Lord, can be a perſecutor; no true Proteſtant can harbour any ſuch idea as that of eſtabliſhing religion by force. Is the Spaniard in Mexico to be an example for a Proteſtant legiſlator?

Religious

Religious liberty is nearer to the heart and conſcience than *civil* liberty; for why are Roman Catholics deemed enemies to our conſtitution? Not becauſe they don't love liberty, (we owe Magna Charta to them) but becauſe, without ſubverting the conſtitution and the law, the Romiſh religion can never be reſtored.

The Reformation was not the work of force.—Science had begun to dawn, and to diſpel ſuperſtition. The tyranny of Rome was become hateful, and her authority contemptible, when that great event took place. The deſires and opinions of the people co-incided with the humours of the King; and the moment parliament had eſtabliſhed the Proteſtant religion, it became not the voice only, but the act of the whole nation.

The

The caſe of Canada is totally different. The people *there adhere to their religion, and did not ſurrender* without a ſtipulation and ſolemn engagement for the free exerciſe of it. Your Lordſhip was miniſter when the capitulation was granted by Sir Jeffery Amherſt, and you found no fault with that able General for that prudent and humane conceſſion. This freedom was again inſured at the peace, approved and confirmed by parliament; nor did your Lordſhip, in your long diſplay of eloquence * on that occaſion, once blame that part of the treaty. But you are now pleaſed to call the meaſure *atrocious*, *ſhallow*, and *inept*, becauſe it has ſecured to the clergy their property, and becauſe it has ſubſtituted an oath of allegiance inſtead of

* Lord Chatham ſpoke three hours and a half againſt the peace.

that

that of ſupremacy as required by the 1ſt of Elizabeth. The beſt diſtinction I know between eſtabliſhment and toleration is, that the greater number has a right to the one, and the leſs to the other. The public maintenance of a clergy is inherent to *eſtabliſhment*; at the Reformation, therefore, as much of the church eſtates as was thought neceſſary for its ſupport, was transferred to the Proteſtant church as by law eſtabliſhed. Surely then, when the free exerciſe of the national religion was given to the Canadian nation, it could never be underſtood that they were to be deprived of their clergy; and if not, a national proviſion for that clergy follows of courſe.

It has alſo been aſſerted, that the Proteſtant religion is rooted out of Canada by this bill. The reverſe is the truth;

truth; for no man who *is*, or who may become a Proteſtant, is to pay tythes or any church dues to the Romiſh eſtabliſhment, but the money is ſtill to be collected, in order to conſtitute a fund for the raiſing and ſupporting of a Proteſtant church in Canada. And little, my Lord, as it may be thought proper to introduce the King's name in a diſcourſe of this nature, yet well-meaning men will be glad to learn, that his Majeſty, for ſome time paſt, has at his own expence maintained two proteſtant clergymen in Canada, natives of France, perſons of ability and character, recommended by Dr. Majendie, and who are now in that country, executing their functions with diligence and attention. And there is a plan under actual deliberation for the further advancement of the proteſtant religion.

Some have doubted whether thoſe clauſes of the 1 Eliz. which eſtabliſh the oath of ſupremacy, extend to any of his Majeſty's preſent dominions but ſuch as belonged to the crown when that memorable ſtatute was made. If this conſtruction is a true one, the Canadians were not obliged to take the oath of ſupremacy; and the new oath which the Quebec bill has eſtabliſhed, is ſo far an acquiſition, and advantageous to the cauſe of proteſtantiſm, as it adds to the common oath of allegiance, and obliges every Catholic of Canada, who ſhall from henceforth exerciſe any function, civil or religious, *to renounce all pardons and diſpenſations from any power or perſon whomſoever contrary to that oath.* But if we are to ſuppoſe the above-mentioned conſtruction to be falſe, and that every part of the 1ſt of Eliz. extends to all his Majeſty's preſent

dominions,

dominions, I will venture then to aſſert that the Roman Catholic religion would not have had in Canada even the advantage of a toleration, if the oath of ſupremacy had not been repealed. For no honeſt Roman Catholic Prieſt could have taken that oath in the true ſenſe of the words in which it is expreſſed; and if he had ventured to exerciſe any eccleſiaſtical function without having taken it, he would have been ſubject to all the penalties and diſabilities which the law has in ſuch caſe inflicted; and that there are perſons in Canada ready to commence proſecutions againſt every offender of this kind, we can hardly doubt, when we recollect that one grand jury thought it their duty to make a public preſentment of every Roman Catholic of the province; and muſt therefore have conſidered them not only as perſons not under the protection of the law, but as

offenders againſt it. But though the legiſlature has thought fit to repeal the oath eſtabliſhed by the 1ſt of Eliz. and to ſubſtitute another oath in the place of it, which in truth is no more than what has been frequently done before; yet the King's ſupremacy is not on that account in any danger, as has been ignorantly and abſurdly ſuppoſed. The Quebec bill, inſtead of giving up his Majeſty's ſupremacy, aſſerts it as eſtabliſhed by the 1ſt of Eliz.; that is, in all caſes, eccleſiaſtical as well as civil; no eccleſiaſtical officer or miniſter can exerciſe in Canada any authority or juriſdiction that is not derived from the crown: and if any man ſhall hereafter preſume to exerciſe therein any powers derived from any foreign authority, or juriſdiction whatſoever, or ſhall maliciouſly and adviſedly endeavour to advance or ſupport the claims or preten-

ſions

ſions of the Pope, or of any foreign prince or ſtate, he will ſtill be ſubject to the ſame penalties to which he would have been liable if the Quebec bill had never paſſed; and the law of England has ſtill in ſtore puniſhments fully ſufficient to deter the moſt zealous Catholic of Canada from the commiſſion of ſuch an offence.

Since then your Lordſhip has been ſo very ſevere in your ſtrictures on this part of the Quebec bill, let me again implore you to tell us what plan you yourſelf would recommend; Would you *now* conſtrue the *free exerciſe* of *religion* to be leſs than the Canadians thought it when they threw themſelves upon your faith? Would you now become their perſecutor? Or would you ſtill ſuffer them to enjoy their religion, with its conſequential property; not however by

the

the conſtitutional authority of an act of parliament, but by virtue of an actual exerciſe of a diſpenſing power in the crown?

Your Lordſhip is ſaid to have aſſerted theſe two things; that the bill was intended to raiſe a ſtrength in Canada, in order to intimidate other parts of America; and then, that the bill was injurious to the Canadians.

The imputed injury is, that the law of France which is deſpotiſm, is *entailed*, and the law of England which is freedom, *annulled*.

There is a diſtinction to be made between the *law* of France, and the *government* of France. The one *is*, the other is *not*, deſpotic. The law of France originated in freedom. The

Franks

Franks were a people of Germany, who came and ſettled in Gaul: their kings were elective, and their power ſo limited, that all their authority was derived from their merit and virtue *. They preſerved their liberties till the 13th century, when the firſt breach was made by Philip the Fair, aſſiſted by Enguerrand de Marigni, his prime miniſter. Nor till the final ſubverſion of the French conſtitution, are we to date the fluctuations in the adminiſtration of their juſtice, the inſtability of property, the baniſhments of their parliaments, together with their lettres de cachet, none of which, my Lord, are the inſtitutions of law, but the exceſſes of that power, which has ariſen upon the *demolition* of law. What a glorious and

* Reges ex nobilitate; duces ex virtute ſumunt; nec regibus infinita vel libera poteſtas. Et duces exemplo potius quam imperio præſunt. *Tac.*

happy

happy revolution would France experience, could you at this moment reſtore her ancient laws, free from the controul of power!

This is the very bleſſing in which the Quebec bill inſtates the Canadians, not *torn* from the church, but ſeparated from the ſtate of Rome; they are in poſſeſſion of the law which they love, under a government that muſt take that law for its guide, where the miniſters of the crown can neither iſſue a general warrant, nor impriſon by a *lettre de cachet*, but every illegal or oppreſſive act that would be impeachable and puniſhable againſt an Engliſhman, will be equally criminal, in reſpect of the Canadians.

One word to the policy of this bill, and I have done. I do not mean to conſider

conſider the general policy, whether England had better have reſted upon her natural innate ſtrength, or have become the head of a divided empire, over different nations of different faith. Her former ſtate, as in the days of queen Elizabeth, was the theme of poetical rapture.

> Oh England, model of thy inward greatneſs,
> Like little body, with a mighty heart.
>
> SHAKESPEAR.

Were the ſame poet to celebrate your adminiſtration, he would ſpeak of England as,

> ——Beſtriding the world
> Like a Coloſſus.——

But, my Lord, whomever we pretend to govern, whether natural-born ſubjects or adopted ones, this is certain, that *that* policy is beſt, which is beſt calculated to unite them all in one com-

mon bond of intereſt, affection, and duty.

Here, my Lord, let me aſk what was your object in *acquiring*, what in *retaining* Canada, but that France might not have at her command a body of men, either to attack our American ſettlements in time of war, or haraſs them in time of peace, by inciting the native Indians to invade them? Would you wiſh, my Lord, to ſpoil the fruits of your own conqueſt in the worſt manner poſſible? Which would be, to keep the hearts of the Canadians devoted to France, whenever ſhe might call them to arms.

But there is another conſideration which makes the affection of the Canadians ſtill more deſirable.—I ſhould be afraid to mention it, if your Lordſhip had

had not proclaimed it already; it is the preſent ſtate of Boſton: Should, my Lord, a fatal neceſſity ariſe, (as your Lordſhip has been too apt both to prognoſticate, and to adviſe) to *coerce* America; do you wiſh, in that melancholy event, to combine the heart of the Canadian with that of the Boſtonian? Were Canada now in the poſſeſſion of France, and ſhould the Boſtonians reſolve upon rebellion, there can be no doubt whither they would look for ſupport, and for encouragement. But the loſs of that hope may happily diſpoſe them to better thoughts.

If then, my Lord, the Quebec bill is founded in that firſt principle of all law, *the concurrence and approbation of the people*, and if its end is that, for which all government ought to be inſtituted,

the happineſs of the governed, then will this bill which your Lordſhip thought *atrocious*, *ſhallow*, and *inept*, appear conſonant to juſtice, wiſdom, benevolence, and policy; and the legiſlature of this country will have followed an illuſtrious example of antiquity, in making ſuch regulations for the Canadians; "ut "in ſuâ ripâ legibuſque ſuis, mente "animoque nobiſcum agant."

FINIS.

951 s